



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/670,967	09/25/2003	Weston Wilhour	7984-A03-003	7022	
33771	7590 06/15/2005		EXAM	INER	
PAUL D. BIANCO: FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS,			HORTON, YVO	HORTON, YVONNE MICHELE	
GUTMAN, BONGINI, & BIANCO P.L.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
601 BRICKELL KEY DRIVE, SUITE 404 MIAMI, FL 33131		3635			

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commons	10/670,967	WILHOUR, WESTON				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Yvonne M. Horton	3635				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. & 133)				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 September 2003</u> .						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.	4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) 12-20 is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-11</u> is/are rejected.	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-11</u> is/are rejected.					
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 September 2003</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Ke

Art Unit: 3635

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "10" has been used to designate both "sidewalls" and "support posts". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filling date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: "then" in line 2, should be --than--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Page 3

Art Unit: 3635

Claims 1,3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent #4,577,444 to SANDERSON. SANDERSON discloses the use of a post framing system including a plurality of support posts (12) each having an upper layer (48), a lower layer (42), and at least one middle layer (12a); a plurality of low wall sections (30); and a plurality of high wall sections (34). Regarding claim 3, SANDERSON further includes a skirt assembly including an inner skirt (20) and an outer skirt (138); wherein the inner skirt (20) includes a plurality if notches (22). In reference to claim 4, the interior surfaces of the support posts, low walls, and high walls.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #4,577,444 to SANDERSON in view of US Patent #6,427,407 to WILSON.

Art Unit: 3635

Regarding claim 5 and 8, SANDERSON discloses the basic claimed post framing system, as disclosed above, except for the inclusion of jamb members. WILSON teaches that it is known in the art to provide a post framing system with jambs (30) and a plurality of horizontal members (as at 18b) therebetween. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the system of SANDERSON with the jamb members of WILSON in order to properly place the system within an opening in the building. In reference to claims 6 and 9, WILSON teaches the use of a corner wall (20) and angle brace (34). Regarding claims 7 and 10, the low 30) and high (34) walls of SANDERSON are end walls. In reference to claim 11, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to select a known wall height or length suitable for the use intended as an obvious matter of design choice. For instance, if the post framing system where being used to form a modular wall library wall dimensions of varying height and lengths would bee appropriate in order to accommodate different types of books therein.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 12-20 are allowed.

Art Unit: 3635

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yvonne M. Horton whose telephone number is (571) 272-6845. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am - 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl D. Friedman can be reached on (571) 272-6842. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yvonne M. Horton Examiner

Art Unit 3635

6/12/05
